

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 21, 2007 considered claims 1-5, 9-24, 28-38 and 41-46. Claims 1, 3, 9-20, 22, 28-38, 41, 43, 44, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Simonds et al.* (US 2004/0093155) hereinafter *Simonds* in view of *Treyz et al.* (US 6,526,335) hereinafter *Treyz*. Claims 2, 4, 5, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Simonds* in view of *Treyz*, and further in view of *Grace et al.* (US 2005/0262146) hereinafter *Grace*. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Simonds* in view of *Treyz*, and further in view of *Little et al.* (US 2004/0172531) hereinafter *Little*.<sup>1</sup>

Claims 42 and 45 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

By this paper, claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 22, 23, 28-32, 43, and 46 have been amended<sup>2</sup>. Claims 1-5, 9-24, 28-38, and 41-46 remain pending in the application.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic communications of July 20, 2007. A summary of those communications is included herein.

The invention is generally directed to a computing device which includes both a telecommunications interface and an ignition switch interface. The telecommunications interface is for coupling to a mobile phone network. The telecommunications interface is operable to receive data from the mobile phone network. The computing device may also include a network interface configured to couple to devices external to the computing device to provide data from the mobile phone network to devices external to the computing device. Additionally, the computing device includes an ignition switch interface configured to selectively connect the computing device to the bus of an external computer through the ignition switch of an automobile when the ignition switch interface is inserted into the ignition switch. In some embodiments, as illustrated in claims 43 and 46, the ignition switch interface may thus be used to supply power to the computing device, receive antenna signals, or transmit audio.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, but with particularity at page 8, lines 6-14.

The art cited in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest at least "an ignition switch interface configured to selectively connect the computing device to the bus of an external computer through the ignition switch of an automobile when the ignition switch interface is inserted into the ignition switch." To show the ignition switch interface, the Office Action cites *Treyz* at Figure 17 step 356. However, *Treyz* does not teach "configured to selectively connect the computing device to the bus of an external computer through the ignition switch of an automobile when the ignition switch interface is inserted into the ignition switch," but rather teaches that "wireless commands sent from the wireless key chain device to [an] automobile personal computer...may start the engine of an automobile...." Thus, in *Treyz*, a connection is made wirelessly to start an engine, but *Treyz* does not teach a connection being made when the ignition switch interface is inserted into the ignition switch as is now recited by the claims. Thus, *Treyz* fails to teach what is recited by the claims of the present application. The other art cited does not compensate for the deficiencies of *Treyz*.

Further, claims 43 and 46 recite "the ignition switch interface configured to connect to the ignition switch of an automobile facilitates at least one of power being supplied to the computing device through the ignition switch interface, an antenna signal being received by the computing device through the ignition switch interface, and audio being transmitted between the computing device and the computer through the ignition switch interface." To show this element prior to amendment, the Office Action cited to *Treyz*. However, the cited portions of *Treyz* teach "the automobile personal computer listens for infrared or RF wireless commands from an in-vehicle remote control [and] [i]n response to receiving such commands, [the] automobile personal computer may tune to a radio station, change the sound system volume, mute the audio, change computer settings, etc." However *Treyz* does not teach "audio being transmitted between the computing device and the computer through the ignition switch interface" as is now recited by claims 43 and 46.

Finally, *Grace* has been cited for showing a number of elements of the dependent claims. However, *Grace* was filed on January 14, 2005, whereas the present application was filed on March 26, 2004, nearly 10 months before the filing of *Grace*. While *Grace* claims priority to a provisional application filed on January 21, 2004, Applicant does not have access to that provisional filing to confirm that the elements cited from the published application are disclosed

and enabled in the provisional application. As such, should any rejections be maintained based on Grace, Applicant requests that a copy of the provisional filing be provided to the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney 801-533-9800.

Dated this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
J. LAVAR OLDHAM  
Registration No. 53,409  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JLO:erb  
CRB0000005742V001